DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 844 JC 770 178

AUTHOR Sutton, Lawrence S.
TITLE A Study to Facilitate Development of a Faculty Workload Policy for Central Florida Community College.
PUB DATE 1 Nov 76
NOTE 68p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Faculty Workload; *Junior Colleges; Policy Formation; Surveys; Teaching Assignment; *Teaching Load
IDENTIFIERS Florida; Student Contact Hours

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in order to determine appropriate components for a full-time faculty workload policy at Central Florida Community College (CFCC). A questionnaire was utilized in a survey of 27 CFCC faculty on what should constitute workload, and workload data for fall term 1976-77 were tabulated. The faculty workload policies of other states were reviewed through the literature and telephone interviews with eight other Florida community colleges were conducted. Results of the survey and tabulation of data from the other sources indicated that full-time faculty workloads averaged fifteen semester hours. In addition, it was found that the average sum of student contact hours and semester hours assigned to full-time CFCC faculty was approximately 33. Because student contact hours are a required portion of the instructor's responsibility and since the State of Florida mandates that a full-time instructional load consists of fifteen semester hours, recommendation was made that the faculty workload policy be quantified as the sum of semester and contact hours not to exceed 33. Additionally, it was recommended that workloads be continuously monitored in order that workloads which do not give instructors adequate preparation time be eliminated. Tabular data are presented throughout the report and a bibliography is appended. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED136844

A STUDY TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT OF A FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY FOR CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Lawrence S. Sutton, M.B.A.

Central Florida Community College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Nova University

December 1, 1976

JC 770 176

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 1

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 3

III. PROCEDURES 15

Definition of Terms 15
Limitations of the Study 17
Basic Assumptions 19
Procedures for Collecting Data 20
Procedures for Treating Data 22

IV. RESULTS 26

V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 42

BIBLIOGRAPHY 50

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure

1. Workload Questionnaire Distributed to Faculty 23

2. Preliminary Questionnaire as Reviewed by CFCC Faculty Senate 24

3. Sample Normal Enrollment Analysis 25

4. Sample Modified Enrollment Analysis 25

LIST OF TABLES

1. Average Workloads - CFCC 30
2. Total Workloads - CFCC 31
3. Workloads - Mathematics Dept. 32
4. Workloads - Business Dept. 33
5. Workloads - Fine Arts Dept. 34
6. Workloads - English Dept. 35
7. Workloads - Science Dept. 36
8. Workloads - Social Science Dept. 37
9. Workloads - Technical Dept. 38
10. Workloads - Radiological Health Dept. 39
11. Responses to Faculty Questionnaire 40
12. Summarization of 9 Florida Community Colleges Faculty Workload Policies 41

Appendix A. Proposed Overload Policy 44

Appendix B. Proposed Class Enrollment in English Classes 45

Appendix C. Proposed Workload Model By a Faculty Member at CFCC . . 47

Abstract

This study was made in order to determine the components of a full faculty workload at Central Florida Community College (CFCC), Ocala, Florida. The purpose for this study was that when proffering an overload policy to the CFCC administration, the CFCC Faculty Senate was unable to determine what constituted a full faculty workload.

A review of literature was made to determine what workload policies were used in other states. Pertinent state, institutional, and accreditation agency policies were reviewed. Differences in such policies were cited.

A questionnaire was distributed to all faculty members at CFCC. The questionnaire listed components which could be considered part of a workload. Twenty-five of twenty-seven respondents checked contact hours as a component of workload.

Statistical tabulations were made of teaching loads at CFCC for the Fall Semester 1976-1977. Average contact hours for 56.43 FTE teaching positions was 17.91. Average semester hours was 15.12. A survey of 8 other Florida community colleges yielded an average semester hour workload of about 15. Reviews of literature surveying semester hour workload in other states yielded similar results.

A recommendation was made to the CFCC administration to quantify faculty load policy as the sum of semester hours and contact hours not to exceed 33. Other recommendations made called for continuous monitoring of workloads so as to eliminate workloads which do not give instructors adequate preparation and planning time.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the Fall Semester of the 1976-1977 academic year, the Faculty Senate of Central Florida Community College (CFCC), submitted a recommended overload policy to the administration (Appendix A). This document in essence, called for full-time faculty members to be given preference for extra compensation assignments in teaching extra classes previously assigned to part-time instructors. In developing the recommended policy, the Faculty Senate did not indicate what constituted a full-time faculty member or what was a full faculty workload. The reason for this omission was because the members of the Faculty Senate were unable to define a full workload.

The purpose of this paper was to help facilitate the development of a faculty workload policy at CFCC. The faculty workload policy is very loosely defined. Statements in the CFCC Policy Manual refer to a full teaching load as one credit hour for each week of employment (15 to 18 hours for an 18-week term and six semester hours for a 6-week session) or the equivalent. Other items constituting a workload are enumerated in the policy statement. A state statute (Florida Statute 230.7601) referred to in the Policy Manual states that community college instructors shall teach a minimum of 15 classroom contact hours per week. The Florida State Board of Education Regulations for the Operation of Junior Colleges (Chapter 6A-8) fails to define faculty workloads anywhere. When the Academic Dean at CFCC was asked to define a full faculty workload, he responded with the answer, "15 credit hours". Yet many faculty members have more than 15 credit hours assigned to them and many have less.

This study, under the auspices of the CFCC Faculty Senate, was undertaken to attempt to develop a workload policy which could be applied to most faculty members at CFCC. In order to do this, workload data for the Fall Term 1976-1977 was tabulated. Averages were compiled on various quantitative measurements of workload. Significant differences between individuals and departments were noted. A questionnaire (Figure 1) was distributed to all CFCC faculty members. The questionnaire listed 10 possible components of faculty workload. Respondents were asked to check off components which they felt were important. Any other input to the faculty workload question was solicited. Seven other Florida community colleges were contacted in order to find out how they had determined faculty workload policy. A thorough review of the literature was made to look at faculty workload policy as it is implemented in other states.

II. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Faculty workload policy has been continuously studied and reevaluated by community and junior college educators throughout the United States. Many insterest groups such as state legislatures, college boards of trustees, college administrators, faculty groups, accreditation organizations, and labor unions have participated in formulating faculty workload policy. While many methods of determining faculty workload have been developed, not one of these methods has ever been accepted by all interested parties.

Central Florida Community College (CFCC) is located in Ocala, Florida. The CFCC Catalog (1976-1977) states that Central Florida Junior College was established by the Florida State Legislature in 1957 as a comprehensive, public, community junior college serving the state of Florida in general and especially the area comprised by the three participating counties - Citrus, Levy, and Marion. The College name was changed to Central Florida Community College (CFCC) effective July 1, 1971.

Operation of CFCC is under the control of the CFCC District Board of Trustees. The members of the board are appointed by the governor from a list of names submitted by the Board of Public of Instruction of the participating counties. The chief administrative officer of the college is the president. The president and Executive Council form the executive body of the college in all matters of instruction and discipline.

When CFCC was first established, the Florida State Statutes did not contain any faculty workload policy. In 1972 a statute was added to Chapter 230, The District School System, which is in effect today. Statute 230.7601,

Teaching faculty; minimum teaching hours per week, reads as follows:

> Each full-time member of the teaching faculty at any institution under the supervision of the Division of Community Colleges of the Department who is paid wholly from funds appropriated from the minimum foundation fund shall teach a minimum of 15 classroom contact hours per week at such institution. However, the required classroom contact hours per week may be reduced upon approval of the president of the institution in direct proportion to specific duties and responsibilities assigned the faculty member by his departmental chairman or other appropriate college administrator. Such specific duties may include specific research duties, specific duties associated with developing television, video tape, or other specifically assigned innovative teaching techniques or devices, or assigned responsibility for off-campus student internship or work study programs. A classroom contact hour consists of a regularly scheduled 1-hour period of classroom activity in a course of instruction which has been approved by the board of trustees of the community college. Any full-time faculty member who is paid from minimum foundation funds or appropriations shall teach a minimum number of classroom contact hours per week in such proportion to 15 classroom contact hours as his salary paid from minimum foundation funds bears to his total salary.

This is the only state law which addresses the question of faculty workload policy. This law makes no mention of credit or semester hours. No maximum teaching load is laid out. The Florida State Board of Education Regulations for the Operation of Junior Colleges (Chapter 6A-8) does not ever mention workload.

While the community colleges of Florida are now funded directly by the state legislature, and the minimum foundation wording is no longer in effect, this statute is the only Florida law which deals with community college workload. The statute has been interpreted by the CFCC administration in its official Policy Manual:

> 3. Responsibilities - Full time teaching personnel are responsible for teaching approximately one credit hour for each week of employment (15 to 18 hours for an 18-week term and six semester hours credit for a 6-week session) or the equivalent. Instructors are expected to work intensively with individual students in relation to materials, problems and questions that relate to formal instructional responsibility; to make positive contributions to campus and community life; and to give appropriate emphasis to study, research and educational planning (Florida Statute 230.7601).

This statement of faculty workload was implemented by CFCC, effective July 1, 1973. While the CFCC Policy Manual references Florida Statute 230.7601, the Policy Manual's interpretation of the statute is not verbatim. Credit hours have been substituted for contact hours. This leaves non-credit situations such as laboratory classes without any written statement as to how they apply to workload. The statute uses the term "classroom contact" hours which also leaves laboratory hours without definition with respect to workload. The policy statement also has added duties in its last sentence which are not explicitly stated in the state statute. A search of Faculty Handbooks, the predecessors of the CFCC Policies and Procedures Manual, from 1964 through 1972 yields no statement similar to the above policy. In fact, there is no mention of any quantitative measurement of faculty workload. The CFCC Faculty Handbooks from the 1965-1966 academic year to 1972-1973 do make the following statement of instructional responsibility:

> Ultimate responsibility for implementation of the instructional program rests with the teaching faculty. Excellence in teaching -- that will inspire and convey the excitement of learning -- stands foremost among the challenges and responsibilities of the college. Instructors should, therefore:
>
> 1. Conduct classroom instruction at the highest possible level of efficiency and interest for students.
> 2. Experiment freely with new devices and procedures in order that interest will be developed and maintained.
> 3. Schedule informal conferences and advisement periods beyonds the regular schedule in order to supplement and complement classroom instruction.
> 4. Plan and develop efficient procedures for evaluation of student learning.
> 5. Follow required procedures and policies with respect to all aspects of class management, including careful maintenance of attendance records, submission of reports, and support of college policies in relation to student behavior.

The current college Policy Manual also contains this statement of responsibilities with the following amendments:

(1) an additional item has been inserted between items 1 and 2, it reads:

> Have responsibilities which may include a night class, an off-campus assignment, or a non-credit class in the event a credit class fails to materialize.

(2) item 3 above has been amended with the following sentence added at the end: These should be approximately ten (10) hours weekly. This was the first time that any set number of faculty office hours was implemented as policy.

(3) item 5 has been changed to item 7 and a new item 6 has been inserted as follows.

> 6. Be a part of the academic procession at graduation commencement exercises if "on duty" -- i.e., full time personnel holding a contract which includes the graduation date with option allowed for regular part-time personnel. Faculty members are expected to participate unless their absence is specifically authorized by the President.

While no positive statement of required teaching hours was indicated in early institutional policy publications, the 15 credit hour workload was already in effect. The CFCC Institutional Self Study (1960-1963) states that the typical teaching load is 15-16 semester hours. Mention was made that the heaviest academic load was 22 contact hours and 18 credit semester hours. In the 1972-1973 Institutional Self Study the minimum teaching load is stated as 15 contact hours. The Study continues that the change from credit to contact hours has made it easier in most cases for divisions on campus to assign workloads. However, there is no consistent policy for workload assignments for all divisions on campus. The statement is also ambiguous as the college Policy Manual distinctly uses the term credit hour and not contact hour. So while no official policy existed until July, 1973 for the minimum number of contact or credit hours which make up a faculty workload, an unofficial, unwritten policy was already in existence.

Central Florida Community College is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. As part of the accreditation procedure, member schools must evaluate themselves every ten years. This is done through the previously mentioned self-studies. Standard Five (Faculty) of the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1971) deals with faculty teaching loads. This Standard reads as follows:

> The components of the workload of faculty members, and the relative weights assigned to each component, will vary from institution to institution, among divisions within a single institution, and between individual faculty members within a division. Each institution should have a concrete plan for the determination and distribution of workloads. It should demonstrate the plan's equity and reasonableness in relationship to what the individual faculty member's expected to do, and to the maintenance of scholastic quality in the teaching component of his total responsibility.
>
> In reporting its faculty workloads for purposes of this Standard each institution must show that a realistic amount of time is available in the sum-total of faculty workloads to care for the duties associated with institutional operation that is, committee assignments, participation in administration, executive responsibility for institutional and divisional functions, duties of public and alumni relations and assigned supervision of student activities.
>
> In calculating the time value of the student instruction load assigned to each faculty member certain factors should be considered including the number of class contact hours, the number of preparations, the weekly student load, available help (such as secretarial, teaching assistants, and grading machines), and the amount of time engaged in research. The institution's plan for the determination and distribution of workloads should be subjected to periodic appraisal and revision.

The Southern Association states that there are items other than semester credit hours which must be considered as part of the workload. The CFCC Self-Study (1960-1963) mentions restricting enrollment to 25 in basic courses like mathematics and English. The 1972-1973 CFCC Self Study contains much more information on determination of teaching loads. Normal workloads for the various teaching divisions are outlined. The study concludes that there seems to be no one teaching load formula that will work for all divisions on campus. Allowing divisions to develop ways to solve their own problems is not the complete answer. Heavy teaching loads in some departments seem

inequitable to the faculty teaching in these areas. Perhaps there should be more consideration given to other duties associated with teaching and to reducing the load of instructors who have several preparations, many contact hours, and many students. Rarely have reductions in workload been given to faculty members because of non-instructional duties. The 1972-1973 CFCC Self Study also fails to mention anywhere, the limiting of class enrollments in any of the disciplines.

Faculty workload has been an integral part of collective bargaining in higher education. The way in which workloads are to be determined is usually spelled out in the bargaining agreement. Some agreements will specifically state the number of hours per week an instructor must be on campus as well as stating the number of credit hours constituting a workload.

Indian River Community College, Ft. Pierce, Florida, in its agreement with the local chapter of the AAUP, has spelled out that a normal teaching load shall consist of 15 to 17 credit hours or its equivalent. Also included is a statement of faculty responsibility which states that a full time faculty member will be responsible for forty hours per week, to include his office hours, committee work, student advisement, classroom teaching, travel to off-campus sites, class preparation, and work assignments. In this agreement, the workload expectations have been listed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Specific numbers of work hours and credit hours have been listed.

Other collective bargaining agreements contain vague and ambiguous statements of workload. A classic example is stated in the City University of New York (CUNY) contract with the New York State Legislative Conference:

> Employees on the teaching staff of the City University of New York shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours,

> assume an excessive student load, or be assigned to an unreasonable schedule, it being recognized by the parties that the teaching staff has the obligation among others to be available to students, to assume normal committee assignments, and to engage in research and community service.

Carr (1973) states that traditionally in industrial bargaining, labor hopes to make gains in the "hours" as well as the "wages" category. "Shorter hours and more pay" sums up a good part of what labor seeks in each new round of bargaining. There are strong indications that in higher education the "hours" issue may become one where management will expect to make the gains in a trade-off for higher salaries. With or without collective bargaining, trustees and administrators are already contending that improvements in compensation will have to be balanced by increased productivity - by heavier teaching loads in terms of hours and courses, larger classes, more out-of-class counseling, and perhaps longer school years.

At this time there has been no collective bargaining at CFCC. The Faculty Senate of CFCC has been actively working on both overload and teaching load policies. The administration has been receptive and have already partially implemented the proposed overload policy. A quantitative approach to determining workload was studied by the CFCC Faculty Senate.

To understand how community college faculty members look at workload, one must first look at the background of the average community college instructor. Typically the instructor is a former high school teacher, right out of graduate school, or a "dropout" from the business world. Very few university professors become community college instructors. With the exception of vocational instructors, most community college instructors envision themselves as college professors. Cohen (1972) claims that community college instructors who fancy themselves as college professors are naive. The community college instructor's primary responsibility is teaching, whereas his university counterpart has research and publication

responsibilities in addition to teaching.

Kelley (1970) in a study of community college faculty attitudes towards workload recorded the following comments: "The teaching load discourages independent study, professional development and publication." "Too many clock hours with students." "Too many committees." "Too many meetings for two few problems." "Too many club activities." "I have too many students and too many classes to do the best job of which I'm capable."

Workload differences between different divisions in community colleges cause hard feelings. At CFCC during the 1976-1977 Fall Semester, the average Technical Division instructor had about 21 contact hours per week. The school average was about 18. The Technical instructors complain about too many hours, social science instructors average 15 contact hours by comparison. Class sizes also vary greatly from division to division. This problem is not unique to 2-year colleges, Starr (1973), at Princeton University, states that rare is the social scientist or teacher in the humanities who does not believe that his colleagues in the natural sciences or professional schools are getting more money for less work.

The Florida State Legislature set community college faculty workloads at 15 contact hours per week. The CFCC Board of Trustees and administration implemented this policy by setting workloads at 15 credit hours per week plus other assigned duties. Fifteen seems to be the magic number as far as workloads. Lombardi (1974) refers to a Carnegie Commission study of community colleges which found the average teaching load in 1951 to be in the range of 18.2 - 29.6 hours. The range in 1972 was 15-20 hours per week. Brown (1976) in a study of 27 community colleges throughout the nation found the "most frequent" teaching load to be 15 credits per week. Shaw (1975) in a study of 57 California community colleges found 51 of

them to have an average workload of 14 to 15 contact hours per week.

The 15 credit hour teaching load is only part of the faculty workload. Teaching load and workload are not synonomous (Shay, 1974). The Southern Association, in its Standard on teaching load maintains that other factors should be considered. These factors include the number of class contact hours, the number of preparations, the weekly student load, and available help. Lombardi (1974) adds items such as making and correcting exams, advising students selecting texts, library books, audiovisual materials, and revising courses. In the community college, these comprise 90 per cent or more of an instructor's time. Other duties may include membership on college and advisory committees, attendance at faculty and other institutional ceremonial meetings, or sponsorship of some campus group or club.

Another measurement of workload is the weekly student contact hour (SCH). This measurement consists of the sum of the products derived by multiplying the enrollment of each class by the number of hours the class meets each week. Lombardi (1974) found SCH to vary from 200 to 1000 in an extreme case. Some collective bargaining agreements limit SCH to 400. Brown (1976) in study of workloads at 27 community colleges found that only seven of them reported an average SCH which averaged out to be 47. Central Florida Community College during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 had an average SCH of 454 for 56 full-time equivalent faculty members. This included a low SCH of 154 and a high SCH of 765.

There are other quantitative measurements of workload. Measurements such as full-time equivalent students served (FTE), total students served, number of preparations, number of sections have been considered. Fitzgerald (1975) suggests calculating a "percentage of load" for each course. Monroe (1972) makes a point for limiting enrollments in English class because

of the great deal of time needed to grade themes and compositions. The National Association of Departments of English has made a policy statement that in an individual workload, college English teachers should teach no more than 25 students per section nor more than three sections per semester of composition - with class size reduced to 20 in developmental (remedial) courses and to 15 in advanced composition or creative writing. Other academic groups surely have made similar policy statements.

There are also arguments against quantitative measurements. Duryea (1973) argues that quantitative controls over faculty members appeal to persons who are ill-informed about how colleges and universities operate, who are interested in economy and efficiency in planning and operating academic programs, and whose psyche finds comfort and security in numbers. Many faculty members contend that quality education and quantitative workload measurements are mutually exclusive. Faculty members view the use of credit or contact hours to measure workload and faculty workload formulas in general "as devices in the hands of management," who presume "that students are little more than inanimate objects within a time and motion study". To them, cost effectiveness is just another attempt "to reduce operating expenses at the cost of quality education" (Lombardi, 1974).

State legislators as guardians of their constituents tax dollars, feel obligated to ensure that the state is providing the best and most economical education for its money. Obviously, larger classes and greater faculty workloads insure a better return on their investment. Nowhere has it ever been proven that students learn better in small classes. College administrators, eager to impress the legislators with their conscientious fiscal management will push for greater workloads. On the other hand, faculty groups and labor unions argue against increased workloads. They feel that learning increases

inversely to the number of hours spent in the classroom and the number of students in the class.

If quantification of workload policy is possible, it will have to be done on an individual, or at least departmental basis. Certainly laboratory supervision cannot be equated with lecture time. Yuker (1974) states that there is a good deal of evidence to show that different amounts of time are required for adequate preparations and effective teaching of different subjects. The 1972-1973 CFCC Institutional Self Study discusses in great length the difference in workloads from department to department. A statistical survey by teaching department at CFCC for the Fall Term 1976-77 reveals significant differences in teaching load between certain departments.

Many community colleges and universities have developed workload formulas. Most operate on a point system which assigns a certain number of points to various components which are determined to comprise a workload. A certain point value is set as a "normal workload". The faculty member's workload is then evaluated to see how close to this "normal workload" point value he or she may be. Adjustments can then be made to compensate for significant differences. Some of these formulas are rather elaborate and are calculated by computers. An analysis of formulas developed at Valencia Community College, Orlando, Fl. and Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Fl., found after all sorts of calculations that a full workload was 15 semester hours or its contact hour equivalent.

Central Florida Community College has never had any grievances concerning faculty workload until the Fall Term 1976-1977. One radiological health instructor teaching 22 contact hours per week was also assigned the duty of writing an extensive safety analysis for a reactor operator training course. This analysis was required by the Atomic Energy Commission. After

listening to the grievance, the administration hired a temporary full time instructor to take his classes for the duration of the semester. Unofficial complaints have come from nursing instructors - long hours, votech instructors - long hours, and English instructors - too many students. The administration has been sensitive to some of these problems and will try to solve the problems. Overload pay for full time faculty members which will be effective Spring Term 1976-1977 may compensate for some of these problems. The CFCC Faculty Senate has assigned a committee to investigate the possibility of developing a workload formula for the school.

Faculty workload policies will continue to be studied for as long as higher education exists. New techniques in education, such as audio/video courses, programmed instruction, and computer assisted instruction will make these policies even more complicated.

Whether or not faculty workload policy at CFCC is computed by a formula, derived from a table, or determined on a divisional basis, this policy must be spelled out clearly so that all concerned interest groups interpret it in the same way. The review of literature points out that many factors can be part of the workload. While not all of these factors can be incorporated into a workload policy, all must be considered and all interest groups must agree on what factors that are used.

III. PROCEDURES

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms were defined:

1. Semester Hours (SH) represents the sum of the credits assigned to each course taught by one instructor during one semester.
2. Student Semester Hours (SSH) are calculated by taking the sum of the products found by multiplying the semester hours for each class taught by an instructor by the number of students enrolled in that class. i.e. If a class is assigned 3 semester hours and 30 students are enrolled in the class, 90 SSH would be assigned to the class. If an instructor had 5 classes exactly like this he would have 450 SSH.
3. Contact Hours (CH) represents the sum of hours that an instructor is scheduled to meet with students each week. These hours are formally scheduled meetings such as classroom lectures, laboratory classes, and seminars. Informal meetings or individual counseling sessions would not be included in this figure.
4. Student Contact Hours (SCH) are calculated in exactly the same way as SSH except that contact hours (CH) are substituted for semester hours (SH).
5. Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students is a measurement used by the State of Florida to fund its community colleges. FTE earned by an instructor is calculated by dividing the total student semester hours (SSH) assigned to an instructor by 30. i.e. If an instructor has 450 SSH, then the FTE earned by that instructor is $450 \div 30 = 15$ FTE. Each year the State of Florida determines a funding rate based upon FTE. Each community college

in the state is funded by multiplying its proposed FTE by that rate.

6. FTE position is a measurement which determines if an employee is fully employed for that term. For the Fall Term 1976-1977, 15 Semester Hours (SH) or its equivalent is considered to be one FTE position. Some FTE positions will consist of less than 15 SH due to laboratory sections. Instructors carrying a teaching load of more than 15 SH are still considered as one FTE position. This measurement has nothing to do with whether or not the employee is a full or part time employee. Some administrators who are full time employees but are teaching a reduced load would be considered to be less than one FTE position.
7. Number of Sections is the sum of individual lecture and laboratory classes assigned to an individual instructor.
8. Number of Preparations is the sum of the different course numbers assigned to an instructor. Each different course number is considered as a different preparation.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Eight community colleges in the state of Florida were contacted in order to obtain information on workloads at each respective school. The number of schools surveyed was strictly determined by chance, the time schedule being followed to produce this report, telephone cost elements, and a basic similarity in workload policy at the schools under study.

The "Survey on Faculty Workloads" questionnaire (Figure 1) was distributed by inter-campus mail to 80 full time faculty members. Responses were received from 27 faculty members. Of these, 9 were members of the CFCC Faculty Senate who responded to the preliminary questionnaire (Figure 2).

The tabulation of faculty workload data, Tables 2-9 do not include:

1. Nursing faculty as their off-campus work schedules at hospitals and team-teaching assignments were not recorded on the existing data files.
2. Physical Education faculty because of workload questions pertaining to coaching assignments.
3. Area Vocational Education School (AVES) faculty because these instructors teach non-credit courses not readily identifiable with college faculty workload.
4. Data Processing and Cooperative Education beacuse these programs are conducted on a part-time basis by full-time staff members.
5. Instructors administratively assigned to the Basic Education Department (Remedial) and functionally assigned to the English

and Social Sciences Department. This was because their class enrollments are limited to 20 which is less than the normal class limit of 35.

Laboratory clases which were assigned Ø credits and having a meeting time which was TBA (to be announced) were not included in the study. This limitation was only found in language laboratory sessions and in a few music courses. Individualized instruction courses bearing the 280 class code were not included in the study.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

For the purposes of this study the following assumptions were made:

1. The nine Florida community colleges sampled were typical of the 28 community colleges in the state and provided a cross-section of the 28 as to size, geographic location, and collective bargaining agreements.
2. Term 1, 1976-1977 (Fall), was a typical semester at Central Florida Community College in respect to faculty work assignments.
3. The ten items listed on the CFCC Faculty Workload Survey (Figure 1) were the most commonly used quantitative measurements of workload.
4. The 27 respondents to the CFCC Faculty Workload questionnaire constitute a cross section of faculty in so far as academic discipline, departmental assignment, and longevity are concerned.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

The procedures involved in collecting data partially consisted of the development of a questionnaire (Figure 1), the distirbution of the questionnaire and the tabulation of the results of the questionnaire. Other procedures involved were the review of pertinent literature, telephone interviews with other community colleges, and the tabulation of faculty workload data for the Fall Term 1976-1977 at Central Florida Community College.

The questionnaire (Figure 1) was used to determine what items faculty members at CFCC considered as parts of their workload. The questionnaire consisted of a check sheet listing ten items that faculty members could consider as part of their workload. These ten items were developed from components of state and federal reports, pertinent literature, and suggestions by members of the CFCC Faculty Senate.

The questionnaire, entitled a "Survey On Faculty Work Loads" was attached to the September 27, 1976 issue of the CFCC Faculty Senate Forum. This means that all full-time faculty members at CFCC received the questionnaire on or about September 27, 1976. About 100 copies of the Faculty Senate Forum are sent to interested faculty, administrators, and staff members at CFCC. Before general distribution of the questionnaire, a preliminary copy (Figure 2) was distributed to the 9 members of the CFCC Faculty Senate for any modification

Responses to the questionnaire were tabulated (Table 11). Any additional comments by respondents were noted in Chapter IV of this paper.

The collection of workload data for CFCC was done by individual instruc-

tor via a computer program using a Xerox 530 Computer at CFCC. This program was a modification of a program which produces a report called the "Enrollment Analysis". Figure 3 shows how data is printed for an instructor on the normal "Enrollment Analysis" report. Figure 4 depicts the data printout as printed by the modified version of the program. The major modification was substituting contact hours (CH) and student contact hours (SCH) for the columns marked CC (cards cut) and % FULL (percentage of class full) respectively.

After the modified "Enrollment Analysis" report was generated, Tables 3 through 10 were tabulated based upon departmental breakdowns of course offerings at CFCC. Table 2 was a summation of Tables 3-10. Table 1 contains averages of Tables 3-10.

The following Florida community colleges were contacted for information concerning faculty workloads:

(a) Lake City Community College, Lake City, Fl.
(b) Daytona Beach Community College, Daytona Beach, Fl.
(c) Santa Fe Community College, Gainesville, Fl.
(d) Indian River Community College, Ft. Pierce, Fl.
(e) Hillsborough Community College, Tampa, Fl.
(f) Miami-Dade Community College, Miami, Fl.
(g) Seminole Community College, Sanford, Fl.
(h) Valencia Community College, Orlando, Fl.

Each of these schools was asked to define a faculty workload. Workload formulas were noted whenever one was used. Table 12 contains a summarization of the workload policies implemented at these schools. The summarized policy includes the number of credit and/or contact hours used in determining a workload. Office hours or total weekly hours are included. Workload formulas are exhibited were they are used in determining workload policy.

PROCEDURE FOR TREATMENT OF DATA

The responses to the questionnaire were tabulated with a weight of one assigned to each item checked off by the respondents (Table 11). After tabulation, the responses were ranked according to the maximum number of checks per item.

Totals of all measurements of categories (columns) for each department (Tables 3-10) tabulated were taken. Table 2 reflects a summarization of these totals. An arithmetic mean or average was taken for each category of measurement using the standard formula for the arithmetic mean of ungrouped data:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

Table 1 consists of the averages for each category by department. The CFCC average reflects the actual average for each individual instructor sampled rather than an average of the averages on Table 1. The CFCC average on Table 1 is consistent with the CFCC average on Table 2.

Standard deviations were taken of the averages for each category on Table 1, 3-10. The formula

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f(X-\bar{X})}{N}}$$

was used to calculate standard deviations. These calculations were performed by a computer program using the Xerox 530 at the CFCC Computer Center. No hypotheses were tested, therefore no measures of significance were made between any of the groups.

Figure 1 - Workload Questionnaire Distributed to Faculty

SURVEY ON FACULTY WORK LOADS

PLEASE RESPOND!!

An ad hoc committee formed by the Faculty Senate of CFCC is currently studying faculty work loads on campus.

The committee would appreciate any ideas you may have as to what constitutes a work load or a possible method for formulating a workload. Page 17 in your CFCC Policy Manual defines the responsibilities of Full-time Teaching personnel. Pages 42 and 43 contain information about faculty responsibilities.

The following list contains some items to consider in determining a full faculty work load. Check off the items which you think help constitute a work load. Add any additional items you wish us to consider. Any comments you may have that will be useful to the committee will be greatly appreciated. Please return this sheet to Larry Sutton in the Career Center.

1. Credit hours _____
2. Contact hours _____
3. Laboratory classes _____
4. Number of students _____
5. Number of preparations _____
6. Number of years course taught _____
7. Committee assignments _____
8. Special activities, i.e. club moderator, coach, etc. _____
9. Time spans between classes _____
10. Off-campus assignments _____
11. Other _____

_____

Figure 2 - Preliminary Questionnaire as Reviewed by CFCC Faculty Senate

FACULTY WORK LOADS

An ad hoc committee formed by the Faculty Senate of CFCC is currently studying faculty work loads on campus.

The committee would appreciate any ideas you may have as to what constitutes a work load or a possible method for formulating a workload. Page 17 in your CFCC Policy Manual defines the responsibilities of Full-time Teaching personnel. Pages 42 and 43 contain information about faculty responsibilities.

The following list contains some items to consider in determining a full faculty work load. Check off the items which you think help constitute a work load. Add any additional items you wish us to consider. Any comments you may have that will be useful to the committee will be greatly appreciated. Please return this sheet to Larry Sutton in the Career Center.

1. Credit hours
2. Contact hours
3. Laboratory classes
4. Number of students
5. Number of preparations
6. Number of years course taught
7. Committee assignments
8. Special activities i.e. club moderator, coach, etc.
9. Time spans between classes
10. Off-campus assignments

Figure 3

SAMPLE NORMAL ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS PRINTOUT

Instructor	Class	SH	ENRLL	SSHR	CC	%FULL	FTE
John Doe	Engl01B Basic Eng	3	30	90	30	100	3.00
	Engl01C	3	30	90	30	100	3.00
	Engl01E	3	31	93	30	103	3.10
	Engl01G	3	32	96	30	106	3.20
	Lit210A Svy Brit Lit	3	25	75	40	62	2.50
		15	148	444	160	93	14.80

Figure 4

SAMPLE MODIFIED ENROLLMENT ANALYSIS PRINTOUT

Instructor	Class	SH	ENRLL	SSHR	CH	SCH	FTE
John Doe	Engl01B Basic Engl	3	30	90	3	90	3.00
	Engl01C	3	30	90	3	90	3.00
	Engl01E	3	31	93	3	93	3.10
	Engl01G	3	32	96	3	96	3.20
	Lit210A Svy Brit Lit	3	25	75	3	75	2.50
		15	147	444	15	444	14.80

IV. RESULTS

There were 27 respondents to the questionnaire entitled "Survey on Faculty Workloads" (Table 11). The highest number of positive responses was 25 for contact hours. Credit hours and laboratory classes ranked second with 22 positive responses each. Many respondents had suggestions as to other items that should be considered. Some respondents also mentioned workload problems germane to their particular area. Some of these were:

> "Nature of course content - no one policy will meet needs of each faculty member. Nursing, by virture of the seriousness of its demands upon both teacher and students should have some consideration concerning contact hours comprising a full load".
>
> "Administrative activities".
>
> "Maximum of 5 (15 hours) to 6 (18 hours) sections of lecture or laboratory. A 3 hour lab is just as time consuming and lasts just as long as three 1-hour lecture sections".
>
> "Writing - when we determine a workload, we should consider the amount of student writing needed to complete a course. A writing course should receive more weight than a non-writing course because the instructor of a writing course spends many, many hours in reading, evaluating, and marking student compositions".
>
> "A new course offering never taught by this instructor".

One instructor submitted a copy of a resolution submitted to Chairpersons of department of English by the Florida Association of Departments of English (Appendix B). This resolution called for limiting enrollments of English composition classes to 25 students. Another instructor submitted deterministic model to determine workloads (Appendix C). This model was based upon a funding formula proposed by the Florida Division of Community

Colleges.

The average number of semester hours (SH) assigned to an instructor at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 15.12 (Table 1). The standard deviation for this average was calculated to be 1.45. This means that 67% of the faculty sampled at CFCC were assigned between 16.57 and 13.67 semester hours per week. The Radiological Health and Fine Arts Departments exceeded this range on the high side. The Science Department was below this range. The highest individual semester hours assigned to a full-time faculty member was 22. The lowest number of semester hours assigned to a full-time faculty member was 8.

The average number of student semester hours (SSH) being taught by an instructor at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 403.54. The standard deviation for this average was calculated to be 102.22. This means that 67% of the faculty sampled at CFCC were teaching between 505.76 and 301.32 student semester hours per week. The only department exceeding the high range was the Science Department. The Technical and Radiological Health Departments were below one standard deviation from the mean average. The highest individual student semester hours that were taught by an instructor was 577. The lowest number of a full-time instructor was 104.

The average number of contact hours (CH) assigned to an instructor at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 17.91. The standard deviation for this average was calculated to be 2.15. Therefore, 67% of the faculty sampled at CFCC were assigned between 20.06 and 15.76 contact hours per week. The only department above one standard deviation from the average was Radiological Health. The English and Social Science Departments were below one standard deviation from the average. The highest number of contact hours assigned to an individual instructor was 31. The lowest number of contact

hours assigned to an individual instructor was 12.

Student contact hours (SCH) for all instructors sampled at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 averaged out to be 454.31. The standard deviation for this average was 105.31. This means that 67% of the faculty sampled were engaged in between 559.62 to 349.00 student contact hours per week. The only department above one standard deviation from the average was the Science Department. The Technical and Radiological Health Departments fell below one standard deviation from the average. The highest individual student contact hours attributed to an individual instructor was 910. The lowest was 154.

The average FTE earned by the instructors sampled at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 13.45. The standard deviation for this average was 3.41. The range in which 67% of the faculty sampled fell between was from 10.01 to 16.86. The Science Department was the only department having an average FTE earned above one standard deviation from the average. The Technical and Radiological Health Departments were below one standard deviation. from the average FTE. The highest FTE earned by a full-time instructor was 23.23. The lowest was 3.47.

The average total enrollment or number of students taught by all instructors sampled during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 144.32. The standard deviation was 38.23. The range containing 67% of the instructors sampled was from 182.55 to 106.09. The only department above one standard deviation from the mean was the Science Department. The Technical Department was the only department below one standard deviation from the mean. The highest enrollment for an instructor was 232. The lowest was 45.

The average number of class and lab sections assigned to an instructor was 5.67. The standard deviation was .63. The range was between 6.30 and

5.04. The Fine Art and Technical Departments were above one standard deviation from the mean. Math, Business, and English were below one standard deviation from the mean. The highest number of sections assigned to an instructor was 13. The lowest was 4.

The average number of preparations required of an instructor was 3.95. The standard deviation was .78. The range was between 4.73 and 3.17. The Technical and Radiological Health Departments exceeded one mean deviation from the mean. The English and Social Science Departments were below one standard deviation from the mean. The highest number of preparations assigned an individual instructor was 8. The lowest was 1.

While the highest number of contact hours reported from the computerized tabulation was 31, some instructors actually had more. An open classroom situation in the Business Department has required two full-time instructors to be on hand 45 hours each per week. One technical instructor was assigned eleven straight contact hours on one day. One technical instructor with 31 contact hours was also assigned the job of maintaining a computer program which is used to make attendance reports for the Area Vocational School.

Table 12 summarizes the workload policy at the 9 community colleges which were contacted. With the exception, of Hillsborough Community College, the normal workload was 15 semester hours. Valencia was the only school which considered enrollment and the number of preparations as part of the workload. The Miami-Dade point system is essentially one in which 15 semester hours would equal 60 points which is a full workload.

TABLE 1 - AVERAGE WORKLOADS BY DEPARTMENT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FALL 1976-1977

DEPT.	FT	PT	FTE POS	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
Math	6	4	7.1	15.4	420.0	17.00	452.6	14.00	128.4	4.6	3.4
Business	6	5	6.8	14.11	476.0	16.47	559.0	15.87	159.0	4.7	3.5
Fine Arts	11	1	10.0	16.6	411.7	18.40	453.1	13.72	157.7	6.8	4.2
English	7	1	5.2	15.0	433.0	15.00	433.8	14.46	144.6	5	2.5
Science	6	5	6.86	12.09	524.6	17.93	633.6	17.48	213.7	5.97	4
Social Science	8	3	7.2	15.4	488.0	15.5	489.9	16.3	162.6	5.1	2.77
Technical	13	1	10.27	15.5	226.0	20.6	291.8	7.53	82.8	5.8	4.86
Radiological	3	0	3.0	17.0	249.0	23.0	327.6	8.3	112.0	7.6	7.3
Overall				15.12	403.54	17.91	454.31	13.45	144.32	5.67	3.95
σ Std Dev				1.45	102.22	2.15	105.31	3.41	38.23	.63	.78

TABLE 2 - TOTAL WORKLOADS BY DEPARTMENT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FALL 1976-1977

DEPT.	FT	PT	FTE POS	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
Math	6	4	7.1	109	2982	121	3214	99.33	912	33	24
Business	6	5	6.8	96	3237	112	3801	107.9	1079	32	24
Fine Arts	11	1	10.0	166	4117	184	4531	137.23	1577	68	42
English	7	1	5.2	78	2256	78	2256	75.2	752	26	13
Science	6	5	6.86	83	3599	123	4328	119.96	1466	41	28
Social Science	8	3	7.2	111	3513	112	3527	117.1	1171	37	20
Technical	13	1	10.27	159	2321	212	2997	77.37	851	60	50
Radiological	3	0	3	51	747	69	983	24.91	336	23	22
Totals	60	20	56.43	853	22772	1011	25637	759.0	8144	320	223
Averages				15.12	403.54	17.91	454.31	13.45	144.32	5.67	3.95

TABLE 3 - WORKLOADS - MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	14	422	16	472	14.07	149	5	4
F	1	15	342	19	436	11.4	114	5	3
F	1	16	566	16	566	18.87	177	5	3
F	1	15	372	21	460	12.4	124	5	2
F	1	16	451	16	451	15.03	111	4	3
F	1	17	420	17	420	14.00	102	4	4
P	.4	6	207	6	207	6.9	69	2	2
P	.3	4	16	4	16	.53	4	1	1
P	.2	3	87	3	87	2.9	29	1	1
P	.2	3	99	3	99	3.3	33	1	1
TOTALS	7.1	109	2982	121	3214	99.33	912	33	24
AVERAGES		15.4	420	17.0	452.6	14.0	128.4	4.6	3.4
STD. DEV		.92	79.20	1.88	64.72	2.64	28.03	.47	.73

TABLE 4 - WORKLOADS - BUSINESS DEPARTMENT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	12	300	20	500	10.00	100	4	4
F	1	15	567	15	567	18.90	189	5	3
P	.4	6	204	6	204	6.80	68	2	1
F	1	12	546	20	910	18.20	182	4	4
P	.2	3	87	3	87	2.90	29	1	1
F	1	15	459	15	459	15.30	153	5	3
F	.6	9	258	9	258	8.6	86	3	2
P	.2	3	132	3	132	4.4	44	1	1
P	.6	9	285	9	285	9.5	95	3	2
F	.6	9	327	9	327	10.9	109	3	2
P	.2	3	72	3	72	2.4	24	1	1
TOTALS	6.8	96	3237	112	3801	107.9	1079	32	24
AVERAGES		14.11	476	16.47	559	15.87	159	4.7	3.5
STD. DEV		1.30	84.95	2.18	147.70	2.83	28.33	.43	.46

TABLE 5 - WORKLOADS - FINE ARTS

CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	15	537	15	537	17.9	179	5	3
F	1	15	336	12	327	11.2	135	6	3
F	1	18	252	22	367	8.4	116	7	6
P	.2	3	138	3	138	4.6	46	1	1
F	.8	12	357	12	357	11.9	119	4	2
F	1	15	302	21	424	10.07	151	8	8
F	1	12	241	18	287	8.03	108	8	5
F	1	18	462	21	534	15.4	154	5	3
F	.4	6	213	6	213	7.1	71	2	1
F	.6	9	363	9	363	12.1	121	3	1
F	1	21	219	21	219	7.3	145	13	5
F	1	22	697	24	765	23.23	232	6	4
TOTALS	10	166	4117	184	4531	137.23	1577	68	42
AVERAGES		16.6	411.7	18.4	453.1	13.72	157.7	6.8	4.2
STD. DEV		2.9	151.27	3.62	151.33	5.04	34.55	2.3	1.67

TABLE 6 - WORKLOADS - ENGLISH DEPT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
P	.2	3	69	3	69	2.3	23	1	1
F	.6	9	249	9	249	8.3	83	3	2
F	1	15	429	15	429	14.3	143	5	2
F	1	15	444	15	444	14.8	148	5	2
F	.6	9	255	9	255	8.5	85	3	1
F	.4	6	183	6	183	6.1	61	2	1
F	1	15	477	15	477	15.9	159	5	3
F	.4	6	150	6	150	5.0	50	2	1
TOTALS	5.2	78	2256	78	2256	75.2	752	26	13
AVERAGES		15	433.8	15	433.8	14.46	144.6	5	2.5
STD. DEV		.00	24.44	.00	24.44	.81	8.15	.00	.54

TABLE 7 - WORKLOADS - SCIENCE DEPT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	11	533	17	612	17.77	221	6	5
P	.2	3	108	3	108	3.6	36	1	1
P	.4	6	282	6	282	9.4	94	2	1
F	1	16	577	20	643	19.23	211	6	3
F	.46	7	335	9	399	11.17	133	3	3
P	.2	3	96	3	96	3.2	32	1	1
F	1	8	448	21	672	14.93	224	7	4
P	.2	3	54	3	54	1.8	18	1	1
P	.4	6	210	6	210	7.0	70	2	1
F	1	10	415	17	571	13.83	200	6	5
F	1	10	541	18	681	18.03	227	6	3
TOTALS	6.86	83	3599	123	4328	119.96	1466	41	28
AVERAGES		12.09	524.6	17.93	633.6	17.48	213.7	5.97	4
STD. DEV		2.6	74.0	1.70	65.0	2.47	20.2	.47	.95

TABLE 8 - WORKLOADS - SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPT
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	15	546	15	546	18.2	182	5	3
P	.4	6	123	7	137	4.1	41	2	2
F	1	15	477	15	477	15.9	159	5	1
F	1	18	528	18	528	17.6	176	6	3
F	.4	6	99	6	99	3.3	33	2	1
F	.2	3	45	3	45	1.5	15	1	1
F	1	15	441	15	441	14.7	147	5	3
F	1	15	522	15	522	17.4	174	5	2
P	.2	3	105	3	105	3.5	35	1	1
P	.4	6	192	6	192	6.4	64	2	2
F	.6	9	435	9	435	14.5	145	3	1
TOTALS	7.2	111	3513	112	3527	117.1	1171	37	20
AVERAGES		15.4	488	15.5	489.9	16.3	162.6	5.1	2.77
STD. DEV		1.02	79.90	1.06	78.03	2.66	26.6	.35	.94

TABLE 9 - WORKLOADS - TECHNICAL
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
P	.2	3	33	6	66	1.1	11	1	1
F	1	18	228	31	439	7.6	89	7	4
F	1	15	210	18	248	7	83	6	6
F	1	15	345	15	345	11.5	115	5	4
F	1	18	223	28	337	7.43	74	6	6
F	1	15	312	15	312	10.4	104	5	5
F	.4	6	75	6	75	2.5	25	2	2
F	.4	6	48	10	80	1.6	32	4	2
F	1	15	264	15	264	8.8	88	5	3
F	1	13	143	14	154	4.77	55	5	5
F	1	14	247	24	375	8.23	85	5	5
F	1	17	104	24	166	3.47	45	7	5
F	.07	1	26	2	52	.87	26	1	1
F	.2	3	63	4	84	2.10	21	1	1
TOTALS	10.27	159	2321	212	2997	77.37	851	60	50
AVERAGES		15.5	226	20.6	291.8	7.53	82.8	5.8	4.86
STD. DEV		1.54	68.43	6.18	86.13	2.28	20.61	.96	.89

TABLE 10 - WORKLOADS - RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH
CENTRAL FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE - FALL 1976-1977

FT-PT	FTE POS.	SH	SSH	CH	SCH	FTE	ENROLL	NO. SECT	NO. PREP
F	1	16	248	21	299	8.27	96	7	7
F	1	18	224	22	247	7.47	97	8	8
F	1	17	275	26	437	9.17	143	8	7
TOTALS	3	51	747	69	983	24.91	336	23	22
AVERAGES		17	249	23	327.6	8.3	112	7.6	7.3
STD. DEV		.82	20.84	2.16	80.17	.69	21.92	.48	.47

TABLE 11 - RESPONSES TO FACULTY WORKLOAD QUESTIONNAIRE

27 RESPONSES

Item Number	Number of Positive Responses	Rank
1. Credit hours	22	2
2. Contact hours	25	1
3. Laboratory classes	22	2
4. Number of students	18	5
5. Number of preparations	19	4
6. Number of years course taught	1	10
7. Committee assignments	17	6
8. Special activities	14	7
9. Time span between classes	2	9
10. Off-campus assignments	11	8

TABLE 12 - A SUMMARIZATION OF 9 FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICIES

School	Policy
Central Florida	15 semester hours, 10 office hours
Daytona Beach	15 load hours, 40 hour work week load hours = average of credit and clock hours
Hillsborough*	12 credit hours = 15 contact hours, 10 office hours
Indian River	15 to 17 credit hours, 40 hour work week
Lake City	15 credit or contact hours, 2 lab hours = 1 credit hour
Miami-Dade	60 points - 1 lecture hour = 4 points 1 laboratory hour = 3 points
Santa Fe	15 semester hours, 25 hour work week
Seminole	the sum of credit hours and contact hours 30-32 is a normal load
Valencia	credit hours + contact hours + 10% enrollment + preparation factor 45 is normal load with range of 40-50

*13 week quarter instead of 18 week term

V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is obvious that any workload formula or policy must be based upon the 15 semester hour teaching load. In this time of cost effectiveness and instructional accountability, the minimum 15 classroom contact hour load mandated by the State of Florida must be implemented by the CFCC administration. The studies conducted by Lombardi (1974), Brown (1976) and Shaw (1975) confirm the 15 semester hour teaching load as an unofficial national policy. This figure was further confirmed by the sample of 9 Florida community colleges (Table 12).

The average sum total of contact hours and semester hours assigned to a full-time instructor at CFCC during the Fall Semester 1976-1977 was 33.03. This figure, rounded off to 33, is an effective determinant of workload. The standard deviation was 2.88 which allows for an effective range of approximately 33 to 36.

The official CFCC Policy Manual requires a faculty member be available for consultation by students at least ten hours per week. To be effective, faculty members need at least one hour of preparation for each one in the classroom. A CH plus SH sum of 36 would only allow for a maximum of 12 hours preparation time based on a 40 hour week. Ideally a CH plus SH sum of 30 would yield 15 hours for preparation. Because some courses will have laboratories causing an inequality between the CH and SH assigned to an instructor 33 is the recommended figure on which to base a full faculty work load.

Any assignment resulting in a CH plus SH sum greater than 33 should result in overload pay for that individual. Every effort must be made to limit the CH plus SH sum to 33. This figure was the recommendation made to the CFCC Faculty Senate by the ad hoc committee study in workloads.

Another recommendation was limiting the enrollment in courses requiring large amounts of subjective grading (compositions, themes, term papers, etc.) to 25. Possibly, enrollment limits can also be implemented on courses of study where other organizations or interest groups have so recommended. This recommendation can be studied further by the ad hoc committee. Class sizes in courses in which objective methods of student evaluation are used can be increased to compensate for enrollment limitations imposed on certain courses.

Every effort must be made by the administration to schedule released time for instructors who are officially assigned non-instructional tasks which are above and beyond the recommended teaching load. Instructors who are involved in open classroom or laboratory instruction must have relief from classroom supervisory duties so that they may engage in planning, test grading, etc.

It is important that the CFCC continuously monitor inequities in faculty workloads. It's recommended that the modified "Enrollment Analysis" report should be made a working document with which to monitor workloads. Additionally, statistical surveys similar to the one in this paper should be made periodically to evaluate the distribution of workloads between departments and individuals within departments. Studies of this type will allow administrators to effectively evaluate programs and courses as to enrollments and earned FTE.

Whenever a course section not covered by the duties of the regular full time teaching faculty is scheduled, the Division Director will offer the additional section to all eligible, qualified, full time instructors before employing a part time lecturer.

Definition of qualified:

Any instructor who is presently teaching the course or who is certified by the state or nationally recognized certifying agency and has taught the course within the last three (3) years at an accredited college shall be considered qualified. At the beginning of each academic year each Division Director shall submit, to the Dean of Academic Affairs, a list of all full time faculty members indicating all courses for which they are qualified. Each instructor will sign this list indicating his/her agreement with his/her qualification. At his/her discretion and with the approval of the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Division Director may qualify an instructor for a course that the instructor has not taught for three (3) years, provided that the instructor is certified to teach community junior college and a letter of justification is submitted with the qualification list.

Administrators and directors shall not be qualified to receive overload compensation.

Definition of eligible:

Each Division Director will establish a list of all qualified instructors for each course. Initial placement on the list shall be based on the following criteria:

(1) Years of teaching experience at C.F.C.C.* in the subject area being offered.
(2) Years of teaching experience at C.F.C.C.
(3) Academic degree.
(4) Years of teaching experience at college level.
(5) Years of teaching experience or job and/or trade related experience.

Procedure for utilizing criteria in determining eligibility:

(1) All instructors shall be ranked on the basis of the first criterion.
(2) When two or more instructors are equally qualified, the next criterion shall be applied.
(3) In the event that all criteria are utilized and there is still a tie, the instructors shall be randomly assigned using objective sampling procedures such as drawing numbers, etc.
(4) Coordinating instructors and department chairmen will be placed at the bottom of the list intitially.

After the list is established the Division Director will offer the first additional section to the top name on the list. If that instructor accepts the overload section he/she will be ineligible for another overload section until all instructors on the list have been given the option of an overload section. If the instructor rejects the offer of an overload section, he/she remains at the top of the list. The next accepting instructor goes to the bottom of the list.

*CFCC will be understood to include Central Florida Junior College and Hampton Junior College.

Appendix B.

FADE

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH

Chairpersons of Departments of English in Florida Colleges and Universities

Whereas the official document, "Education Policy for the State of Florida," specifies that the first goal of education is "Basic Skills" with emphasis on the fact that "all Floridians must have the opportunity to master the basic skills for communication and computation (listening, speaking, reading, writing and arithmetic)";

Whereas Freshman English as offered in the two-year and four-year colleges and universities of Florida "calls for development of critical skills in thinking, reading, and writing, including the effective uses of reference and resource materials";

Whereas a student in Freshman English should demonstrate college level proficiency:

(1) in recognizing and using basic processes of clear thought and clear communication,

(2) in recognizing and using appropriate language,

(3) in reading expository and imaginative writing with understanding;

Whereas the number of students in Freshman English has increased disproportionately to the amount of funds and the number of faculty;

Whereas the situation in many Florida institutions is such that the number of courses taught by each faculty member and the number of students per course have increased beyond acceptable standards;

Whereas the National Association of Departments of English has voiced reasonable standards for teaching Freshman English in its policy statement on "Class Size and Workload for the College and University Teacher of English," viz.

> In an individual workload, college English teachers should teach no more than 25 students per section nor more than three sections per semester of composition—with class size reduced to 20 in developmental (remedial) courses and to 15 in advanced exposition or creative writing

Therefore, be it resolved that the Florida Association of Departments of English calls upon the State Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, the Division of Community Colleges, the Board of Regents, and the Administration of individual colleges and universities:

(1) to provide and administer adequate budgets for limiting both class size and faculty workloads at levels that will permit maximum learning opportunities for students in Freshman English;

(2) to recognize that without limitations on the number of courses and students assigned to teachers, quality instruction is impaired;

(3) to understand fully that in the absence of such provisions and limitations, the first goal for education as enunciated in the statement on "Education Policy for the State of Florida" is denied.

Appendix C.

- PROPOSAL BY MIKE BUCHA -

SUBJECT: A deterministic model for the mean instructional load at CFCC in college transfer programs. Full time instructors, department heads, division directors.

Rationale; Definitions;

1. Any model developed for the purpose of measuring the mean instruction load must take into consideration the state funding formula. Since the state funding varies from discipline to discipline, it is only equitable that this variance be included in the model. The basic unit for state funding is FTE (Full Time Equivalent) which represents a composite of students registered for 30 credit hours. For courses carrying a certificate goal (contact hours only), the contact hours are transformed to FTE credit hours; illustration: a composite of students carrying 30 credit hours in mathematics earns (.9) FTE units and, at a large community college, such as CFCC, one such unit in mathematics earns $942.10. At a small community college, one such FTE unit earns $1,290.69. For a composite of students carrying 30 credit hours in "Health Professions", the college earns 1.6 FTE which totals (1.6)($942.10). Since CFCC has a fixed salary schedule for all instructors in all disciplines, this funding formula will cause class size to vary from program to program and discipline to discipline.

2. What variable to be included? Such a list could be very inclusive or limited to a few. The most basic variables in the assigned weights are being given consideration in this model. The word "basic" will vary from individual to individual but a strong consensus can be found. This model considers 3 such variables.

3. Variables and weights.
This model uses an interval for computing the mean instructional load. Being limited to one number is not a practical system and therefore, each variable will be assigned an interval - lower to higher - in determining the mean load. Also, each variable will be given a weight since one variable will cause more "output" in effort than another.

(a) Variable (total class size). The interval for the variable is [70, ~~100~~ 110]. Any arguments? This interval is for credit courses requiring no labs and not an excessive amount of grading work such as you find in certain English and Social Science courses where term papers are involved. This variable will be given a weight according to the state level of funding which is attached. For courses involving many hours of grading, an interval [60 -100] is considered. For lab course in chemistry, biology, anatomy, class size intervals [15 - 25]; if stations are available; should be given a a weight of 2/3 since the state funds only 1 credit hour for the 3 contact hours. Any arguments?

(b) Variable: "Credit hours"
The interval for "Credit hours" [14,16] with a weight of 1. The difference in state funding has been accounted for in the variable "Class size".

(c) Variable: Number of preparations.
Interval [2,3]. What weight shall be assigned this variable? Some will say that after 10 years no preparations are necessary. This is not a valid subjective judgement since preparation also includes "preparation for the type of class you have", as well as the subject matter preparation. There is a strong correlation between preparation and quality instruction so a weight of 2 is assigned. Any arguments?

Examples: Instructor in Mathematics

Norm Load		FTE Factor		Actual Load for Instructor (Student)	
(a) Class Size [70 - 110]	x	(.9)	= [63 - 99]	120 (.9)	= 108
(b) Credit Hours [14 - 16]	x	1(wt)	= [14 - 16]	16 (1)	= 16
(c) Class Preparation [2,3]	x	2(wt)	= [4, 6]	3 (2)	= 6
Total for mean load			= [81, 121]	Total	= 130

The actual load number falls outside of the mean load interval and, therefore, this instructor is performing above mean load. What to do about it is another fiscal problem.

Example 2 - Division Director

Norm Load	FTE Weight	Actual Load
Class size [42, 61] (1) (Science)	= [42, 61]	50(1) = 50
Credit hours [8.4, 9+](1)(wt) 9/15 instructor	= [8.4, 9+]	9(1) = 9
Class Preparation [2, 3](2)(wt)	= [4, 6]	2(2) = 4
Totals - mean load	[54.4 - 76]	Totals 63

This total score falls in the interval for mean load. The director is performing at mean level in his instructional duties.

For certificated personnel in the technical program a similar model can be constructed.

For certificated personnel in the certificate program (no credit hour courses) a similar model can be constructed.

Before going any further a thorough study of the submitted model should be made.

DISCIPLINE	1973-74 COST ANALYSIS COLLEGE FTE	COLLEGE COST/FTE	1975-76 FORMULA GENERATION FUNDING LEVEL	STATE FUNDS/FTE	ESTIMATED FTE	GENERATED DOLLARS
1.1001 AGRICUL. & NAT. RES.			1.0			
1.1002 ARCHITECT. & ENVIRON.	29.7	$1,285.67	1.1	$1,026.37	28.9	$29,662
1.1003 AREA STUDIES	5.4	$729.60	0.7	$659.29	1.4	$923
1.1004 BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	6,102.7	$1,180.93	1.0	$950.42	6,077.1	$6,536,128
1.1005 BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT	2,558.7	$1,059.66	0.9	$855.99	2,915.8	$2,495,887
1.1006 COMMUNICATIONS	331.0	$1,573.70	1.3	$1,200.57	386.4	$463,900
1.1007 COMPUTER & INFO. SCI.	134.7	$1,151.98	1.0	$935.38	139.7	$130,672
1.1008 EDUCATION	4,580.0	$1,515.64	1.3	$1,224.74	4,970.0	$6,086,935
1.1009 ENGINEERING	66.5	$1,894.41	1.4	$1,301.61	103.3	$134,456
1.1010 FINE & APPLIED ARTS	8,732.4	$1,293.32	1.1	$1,020.13	9,716.7	$9,912,295
1.1011 FOREIGN LANGUAGES	1,629.4	$1,325.64	1.1	$1,023.44	1,771.2	$1,812,713
1.1012 HEALTH PROFESSIONS	193.9	$1,899.00	1.6	$1,507.49	37.0	$55,777
1.1013 HOME ECONOMICS	108.3	$1,468.52	1.2	$1,096.42	110.7	$121,374
1.1014 LAW	34.3	$1,300.67	1.1	$1,034.31	34.8	$35,994
1.1015 LETTERS	13,774.0	$1,179.31	1.0	$937.47	15,412.5	$14,448,698
1.1016 LIBRARY SCIENCE	23.2	$907.94	0.7	$646.11	34.7	$22,420
1.1017 MATHEMATICS	8,360.9	$1,117.63	0.9	$841.27	9,525.7	$8,013,702
1.1018 MILITARY SCIENCE	17.5	$715.44	0.7	$660.71	29.7	$19,623
1.1019 PHYSICAL SCIENCES	6,541.0	$1,206.66	1.0	$938.49	7,250.0	$6,804,807
1.1020 PSYCHOLOGY	5,923.9	$1,025.79	0.8	$763.06	6,711.9	$5,121,614
1.1021 PUBLIC AFFAIRS	48.8	$1,044.14	0.9	$839.22	88.1	$73,935
1.1022 SOCIAL SCIENCES	14,727.3	$1,036.08	0.9	$850.43	16,467.9	$14,004,716
1.1049 INTERDISCIP. STUDIES	1,034.5	$1,116.95	0.9	$853.11	1,834.0	$1,564,604
TOTAL ADVANCED & PROFES.	75,563.1	$1,170.52		$922.35	84,448.3	$77,890,835
1.2100 AGRICULTURE	610.2	$1,490.80	1.2	$1,141.81	806.8	$921,214
1.2200 DISTRIBUTIVE	4,969.5	$1,106.69	0.9	$844.16	6,160.3	$5,200,294
1.2300 HEALTH	6,464.3	$1,721.67	1.4	$1,372.28	8,368.0	$11,148,558
1.2400 HOME ECONOMICS	1,997.2	$1,173.41	1.0	$932.89	2,532.4	$2,362,460
1.2500 OFFICE	9,729.1	$1,212.31	1.0	$937.48	12,233.7	$11,468,902
1.2600 TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL	8,279.2	$1,301.86	1.1	$1,034.48	11,455.6	$11,850,567
1.2700 TECHNICAL	7,161.7	$1,468.87	1.2	$1,132.26	8,702.1	$9,853,000
TOTAL OCCUPATIONAL	39,211.2	$1,351.02		$1,050.66	50,258.9	$52,804,995
1.3100 COMPENSATORY	3,430.8	$1,279.22	1.1	$1,011.01	3,767.6	$3,809,083
1.3200 ADULT ELEM. AND SEC.	6,899.5	$983.03	0.8	$746.76	7,815.2	$5,836,098
TOTAL DEVELOPMENTAL	10,330.3	$1,061.36		$832.72	11,582.8	$9,645,181
1.4100 CITIZENSHIP	3,125.5	$977.58	0.8	$751.36	3,180.7	$2,389,850
1.4200 AVOCATIONAL	1,321.0	$1,211.35	1.0			
TOTAL COMM. INSTR. SRVS.	4,446.5	$1,047.03		$751.36	3,180.7	$2,389,850
COLLEGE TOTAL	129,551.1	$1,212.21		$954.91	149,470.7	$142,730,861

NOTES: SMALL COLLEGES ARE: CHIP FKEY LSUM NFLA PASC ST.J SFLA
UNITARY: LARGE COLLEGES = $942.10; SMALL COLLEGES = $1,290.69
COST ANALYSIS YEAR IS 1973-74
FTE FILE S 26076; TOTAL FTE = 157,961.3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, B. and Romoser, R. Full-Time Instructional Load Policies in Selected Community - Junior Colleges. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 121 367, 1976.

Carr, R. K. and Van Eyck, D. K. Collective Bargaining Comes To Campus. Washington: American Council on Education, 1973.

Central Florida Community College Catalog. Ocala, Fl.: 1976-1977.

Central Florida Junior College Faculty Handbook. Ocala, Fl.: July 1, 1965.

Cohen, A. M. and Brawer, F. B. Confronting Identity, The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Duryea, E. D., Fisk, Robert S., and Associates. Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Fitzjerald, James S. "A Way Out Of The Faculty Load Muddle". Community and Junior College Journal. 45: 30-31, May, 1975.

Institutional Self-Study of Central Florida Community College. Ocala, Fl.: 1960-1963.

Institutional Self-Study of Central Florida Community College. Ocala, Fl.: 1972-1972.

Kelley, W. and Wilbur, L. Teaching In The Community Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1970.

Lombardi, John. Faculty Workload. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 097 925, 1974.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile Of The Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

O'Banion, T. Teachers For Tomorrow. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press, 1971.

Policies and Procedures: Central Florida Community College. Ocala, Fl.: July 1, 1973.

Shaw, Francis F. Analysis of California Community College District Policies of Faculty Teaching Load. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 118 170, 1975.

Shay, John E., Jr. "Coming To Grips With Faculty Workload." Educational Record. 55: 52-58, Winter, 1974.

Standards Of The College Delegate Assembly. Atlanta: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1971.

Starr, S. Frederick. "A Fair Measure of Faculty Workloads". Educational Record. 54: 313-315, Fall 1973.

Yuker, Harold E. Faculty Workload: Myths and Commentary. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 095 756, 1974.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 4 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES